

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of) LATENT HEAT STORAGE DEVICE	
HENRY LUKAS et al.)) Group Art Unit: 3743)) Examiner: Patel, Nihir B.)	
Serial No.: 09/678,990		RECEIVED
Filed: October 4, 2000		FEB 0 4 2003
		TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 30, 2002 (Paper No. 1) Applicants provisionally elects the alleged distinct species of Figs. 1 and 2, with traverse. All of the claims read on the elected species, and furthermore are generic to Figs. 1-5.

37 CFR 1.8 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Bertha Jackson

Applicants believe the restriction requirement is improper because the figures do not represent patentably distinct species as alleged in the Office Action. Rather, as set forth in the application, which is evidence of record, Figs. 1 and 2 are somewhat schematic cross-sectional views of a latent heat storage device made according to the invention and Figs. 3-5 are more detailed views of the latent heat storage device shown in Figs. 1 and 2. See page 9, lines 8-15; and page 13, lines12-13. Accordingly, as set forth in the application, the drawings all represent the same latent heat storage device, not variants of latent heat storage devices.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement, consideration of all the claims as amended and allowance of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffery N. Fairchild

Reg. No. 37, 825

January <u>21,</u> 2003

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 West Madison Street Suite 3800 Chicago, Illinois 60661-2511 (312) 876-1800